



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

taken by Japan may be the means of turning the scale in favor of the permanent integrity and independence of China.

However, in addition to what was finally embodied in the treaties there are certain demands which Japan originally made but later dropped or left for future negotiation. These must also be considered, for they have been taken to reveal especially Japan's ultimate purposes. These "Group Five" demands have given special concern. They pertain to the employment of Japanese advisers, the right to purchase land for hospitals, temples and schools, joint police in certain places where many Japanese reside, the purchase of a certain quantity of munitions of war from Japan, certain preferential treatment in Fukien province, and the right to preach. But even in these propositions there is nothing to prove conclusively that Japan had in view anything other than she professed, namely, the permanent peace of the Far East. Japan has waged two wars to check movements that she regarded as threatening her own national existence. It is natural that she does not want to repeat the costly experience. But the scramble of the Western powers for "rights" in China has been such that not only the virtual dismemberment of China, but the domination of all Asia by these powers is more than a remote possibility. While some of the "Group Five" propositions seemed to aim merely at placing Japan on a par with other powers in certain respects, others probably had the deeper significance of an endeavor to stem a tide that certainly is on and affects both China's and Japan's most vital interests.

But why has China's protest against Japan's action been so bitter? One reason no doubt is that China is nationally more awake than ever before. Then there are rumors of sinister influences behind the scenes at Peking inciting the government to resist Japan's demands. Further, there is a strong feeling of antipathy against the Japanese people on the part of certain Chinese. Hence it is, no doubt, that Japan felt justified in using a kind of coercion to secure acquiescence to an agreement deemed by her to be moderate and patently to the advantage of China. But it is not the first time that China has been coerced. Even as late as 1913, when China hesitated to agree to what England wanted in Tibet, Sir Edward Grey hinted at dire consequences in case of refusal and China gave in.

These seem to be the facts dispassionately stated. It appears plainly, therefore, that the attitude of the United States in the Far East should simply be to extend to Japan and China nothing but appreciation, respect, and continued friendship. In no group of nations is it more apparent than in that of the United States, China, and Japan, that the interests of all are the interests of each, and that the interests of each are the interests of all.

OUR BASIS OF CONSISTENCY

IF THE fear of inconsistency be the bane of petty minds, it is also true that consistency is a jewel of no little merit. We court adverse criticism because it is that kind of criticism that keeps us awake. We are thoroughly convinced that we are not trying to make white appear black, neither are we trying to make black appear white; but when the same mail brings one request for a canceled subscription because we are "too pro-German," and another because we are "evidently anti-German," we are led to a searching of heart.

We have been called "militarists" because we published an article from ex-Congressman Bartholdt, a portion of which "advocated the prohibition of the exportation of arms from this country." The same writer again calls us "militarists" because we associate ourselves with Mr. Bartholdt, who happens to be one of our Executive Committee, and because we gave currency to his "argument for giving aid and comfort to the Hohenzollern military machine." The same friendly individual thinks the peace societies are not facing the issue; that they are "shirking actual conditions and mumbling theories." We have been censured for not shaking our fists in the face of Germany and for refusing to print certain "programs" which have appeared from time to time. Indeed, it is openly charged that "the peace societies are being financed by the Germans." And so it goes.

We do not profess to be able to put out the international conflagration now devastating the world. The fact is we are not a fire company. We are trying to market international asbestos. We are neutral in the sense that we are against all war, and therefore against the nations now at war, so far as they are at war. We have our opinions in the varying issues, but we do not parade them all because they are not all relevant to the real problem we have set before us. Every nation at war honestly considers itself in the right, fighting for self-defense, promoting the highest good. None desires war. And yet war is. It exists; a hideous fact.

Furthermore, we do not feel warranted in attacking any one nation as wholly to blame in the premises, for each has had its faults, its fuel ready for the burning. It is not our business to emphasize those things which embitter and separate nations. We do not propose to emphasize them.

In the midst of the Franco-Prussian war, in August, 1870, this society took the ground that as friends of peace we had nothing whatever to do with the question which of the two great powers were to blame. Our position was then and now is that we aim to show the utter uselessness and criminality of the entire war system, which should be banished from the earth. During our Civil War this society, its officers all loyal to the North, stated over and over that its aim was not to interfere

with the war then going on, but to do away with the custom of war itself by substituting rational, legal, peaceful means, a system of justice for the protection of rights and interests.

We would that we might stop the present war. There are those who think we ought to try. But today, as through the wars of nearly a century, this society pleads for a Congress and High Court of Nations which shall serve as a substitute for war. This Congress and High Court of Nations are going to be extended and permanently established, and when once they are established most of the causes which make for international violence will have disappeared.

It is true that the American Peace Society feels it to be its duty to define as far as possible the rights of belligerents toward each other. It is within our province to try to abate the horrors of war and to lessen its frequency. The rights of neutrals are of interest to us. But we cannot be persuaded by the various and varying demands to take up the cudgel in behalf of this or that belligerent. We say to the nations and to all alike, "We are in the business of distributing fire-proof building material. We shall be glad to furnish you with all that is necessary to preserve you from destruction by fire. Some day you will wish to use it. Will you not give earnest consideration to the matter at once?"

This is the basis of our consistency. We wish our over-partisan readers might understand it and help us along the way.

NEEDED: A PEACE DICTIONARY?

THE word "peace" is unpopular in many quarters—among the nations at war just now, and among the warring friends of the peace movement as well. We are told that the word is tabooed in England because "it does not indicate the aims of the peace workers" and "it carries certain false implications." It is pointed out that there is, for example, a peace of the dead, of craven submission, of laziness, of cowardice, and of ignorance. Therefore we must find a new word—the word "polity," for example.

Mr. Norman Angell, defending this view in *The Cosmopolitan Student*, seems unconsciously to refute his own argument by explaining: "International polity is something more than a name; it represents a definite method of approach to the public and a method of co-operation with all who are seriously at work, whether in the field of legislation or discussion, in determining the best feasible foreign policy for this and other nations." If we similarly define the word "peace," would it not readily serve the same purpose? May not the same be said of any word, of even a coined word such as *legetum* or *judicut*?

We half suspect that the trouble with the word "peace" is that we who are working for its realization get tired of it as a word; while those who are opposing us, whether because of convictions or dislikes, are disgusted with it. The trouble, however, is not with the word, but with the definition we give or fail to give to it.

It so happens that this troublesome word originally meant agreement, or to make a bargain. It is found in its earliest purity in the word *pact*. It means specifically, therefore, freedom from war or hostile attacks, and has long been used by writers upon law as the opposite of war. The word is specifically defined by the Century Dictionary as: "Compact or agreement made by contending parties to abstain from further hostilities."

Dr. George E. Dawson, the eminent scientist, has recently said: "A state of peace in human society and in the individual life is not, then, a state of passivity, of negativism, of weakness, of decay. It is a state of orderly activity, of creative force, of growth. A man at peace with himself, biologically and psychologically speaking, is living a healthy, orderly, dynamic, creative life. A society at peace is living a healthy, orderly, dynamic, creative life in all its members." He calls peace "a mode of creative energy," and adds: "Peace is all that life means of health, growth, achievement. What happens when this condition of peace within the human organism is not maintained may be seen in those malignant growths known as cancers." There is no fighting within the ranks of the many cells that constitute the life of the healthy individual. The same is true of animal and human society. Wherever a social group survives, as this writer says, there is a co-operation and integration of social units in a state of peace. This is true of bees, cattle, wolves. Within every species there is relative peace, without which no species of animals could survive. Nowhere except with human beings is there a fratricidal or intraracial warfare. Families, tribes, and nations could never have been formed if the law had been otherwise. The human race is the only species of animals which wages war upon its own kind. It is peace, therefore, which promotes life in the cell, the animal, the family, the tribe, and in society. It is an indispensable condition for achieving the ends of normal existence.

The following, from a recent number of our esteemed contemporary, *The Army and Navy Journal*, is pertinent and definite. We read: "If there ever was a truculent, noisy, obstreperous member of any community, it is the peace faddist, whether called pacifist or peace quack. He is always pushing forward his opinions, whether they have any practical relation to the subject in hand or not. He is essentially and always pestiferous and cantankerous." We see here that the words "pacifist" and "pacifist," like the word "peace," carry with them also an offensive significance at times. This is true not only for the professed militarists, but for many engaged in promoting our own principles as well. They are words to be conjured with, evidently.

The word "pacifist," used for years at the peace congresses, especially by the French and other foreign delegates, has, however, found no place in the dictionaries, English or foreign. Then, too, the confusion has been deepened lately by an attempt to distinguish between "pacifist" and "pacifist." The word "pacifist" is said to come from the adjective *pacific*, while "pacifist" is thought to be the offspring of the verb *pacify*. By some linguistic twist, not yet clear to us, "pacifist" is considered to mean a "peace-at-any-price" person, one who would rebuke the dogs of war with the sword of soothing words. On the other hand, a "pacifist" is thought to mean Victoriano Huerta, Congressman Gardner, the Navy League, and the others who believe, or seem to be-